

# **Georgia's 2010 305(b)/303(d) Listing Assessment Methodology**

## Table of Contents

Part I – Data Solicitation	3
Part II - Data Acceptability Requirements	3
Part III - Data Assessment Period	3
Part IV - Data Collection – Areas of Focus (Rotating Basin Approach)	4
Part V - Data Rounding	4
Part VI - Assessment of Waters Using the 5-Part Categorization System	4
Part VII - Assessment Methodology for Making Use Support Decisions (Listing/Delisting Strategies)	5
A. Fecal Coliform	5
B. DO, pH, Temp	7
C. Metals	8
D. Priority Pollutants	8
E. Toxicity	8
F. Fish/Shellfish Consumption Guidelines	9
G. Biotic Data (Fish Bioassessments)	9
H. Biotic Data (Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments)	9
I. Data from Lakes with Site-Specific Criteria	10
J. Enterococci Data Collected under the BEACH Act	11
Part VIII - Priorities for Action	12

## **Georgia's 2010 305(b)/303(d) Listing Assessment Methodology**

The outline below provides the listing assessment methodology used for the solicitation, review, consideration and assessment of data for Georgia's 2010 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters. Each listing cycle brings new challenges in the review and assessment of data. The information that follows is intended as a guide. The methodology does not cover all possible scenarios, so best professional judgment was used along with the listing assessment methodology as needed. A best professional judgment approach was also used where insufficient information or data were available to making listing decisions. Each biennial listing cycle, the listing assessment methodology will be updated to include needed changes and to reflect the most current Listing Guidance provided by the USEPA.

### **I. Data Solicitation**

On February 16, 2009, a letter was sent by postal mail or electronic mail to the USEPA, and individuals and/or organizations on the mailing list that is maintained by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GA EPD) for notifying interested parties regarding proposed Rules pertaining to water issues. This letter stated that the GA EPD was gathering water quality data and information to be used in the development of Georgia's draft 2010 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters. Any comments, data, or other information were requested to be submitted by June 30, 2009. The letter included a link to a document on GA EPD's website that provides information as to the requirements for the submission and acceptance of water quality data for GA EPD's use in 305(b)/303(d) listing assessments. A copy of the notification letter was also included on GA EPD's 305b/303d webpage and EPD's "What's New" webpage on March 10, 2009.

### **II. Data Acceptability Requirements**

Data used in listing determinations are subject to the Quality Control/Quality Assurance requirements in the Georgia Environmental Protection Division's Quality Assurance Manual and Quality Assurance Project Plan. Chapter 391-3-6-.03(13) of *Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control* describes requirements that need to be met in order for GA EPD to use water quality data collected by outside sources for use in 305(b)/303(d) listing decisions. Data that did not meet data acceptability requirements were used for screening purposes.

### **III. Data Assessment Period**

All readily available data and information for the calendar years 2007-2009 were considered in development of Georgia's 2010 305(b)/303(d) List of Waters. For data collected in 2009, typically only data from January thru June were available for assessment. In the case of sites where consecutive multiple years of data were available (such as from the core network monitoring sites that are monitored annually), the assessment considered data from 2004-2009. There are instances where GA EPD may choose not to use all years of consecutive data in the assessment of a waterbody. For instance, where a local government or group has conducted specific water quality improvement efforts in the watershed of a waterbody and the data collected before and after the improvement projects provide a clear indication that the project has succeeded in improving water quality, GA EPD may choose only to use data collected after implementation of the water quality improvements. It is the responsibility of the local government or group to submit specific documentation to GA EPD including a description of the improvement project, its location and the date of implementation along with the water quality data supporting the assertion that the project has succeeded. Currently, Georgia has over 2,000 waterbodies on its 305(b)/303(d) list of waters. It is not possible to obtain new data on all of these waters every two years. In cases where no new data had been

collected between 2007 and 2009, EPD continued to use the older data it had available for the waterbodies to make its assessments.

#### IV. Data Collection – Areas of Focus (Rotating Basin Approach)

GA EPD has implemented a basin rotation approach when it comes to monitoring waters, establishing TMDLs and permitting. The waters in the State have been divided into 14 River Basins and each of these basins has been assigned to one of five basin groupings as follows: 1) Chattahoochee & Flint; 2) Coosa, Tallapoosa & Tennessee; 3) Savannah & Ogeechee; 4) St. Marys, Suwannee, Satilla & Ochlockonee and 5) Oconee, Ocmulgee & Altamaha. Each year GA EPD focuses much of its attention on one of these basin groupings. Using this method, each basin receives extensive monitoring every five years. The basins of focus in 2007 were the Savannah and Ogeechee, in 2008 they were the St. Marys, Satilla, Ochlockonee and Suwannee and in 2009 they were the Ocmulgee, Oconee and Altamaha. GA EPD plans to move away from the rotating basis approach in monitoring in the future, but basin rotation monitoring was ongoing in this listing cycle.

Even though EPD tended to concentrate much of its monitoring activity within the basins of focus each year, data was collected throughout the State every year and all of this data was used for assessment purposes in developing the 305(b)/303(d) list of waters. For instance, EPD has approximately 70 stations on streams and lakes located throughout the State that are sampled each year regardless of whether or not the water is located in the basins of focus. In addition, EPD receives data from other GA DNR divisions such as Georgia's Wildlife Resources Division and Georgia's Coastal Resources Division. These groups do not follow EPD's basin rotation plan for sampling, so the data they collect could be from a number of basins. GA EPD also accepts data from outside groups as discussed in Part I and II of this document. This data may have been taken from anywhere in the State. Finally, GA EPD may conduct special projects outside of the basins of focus. Data from these special projects can also be used for assessment purposes.

#### V. Data Rounding

When assessing State waters, GA EPD compares water quality data with their respective water quality criteria. Water quality data for a given parameter will be rounded to the same number of significant digits as the criterion for that parameter before the two are compared for the purpose of making listing determinations. Should it be necessary to perform mathematical operations with the data before comparison with the appropriate criterion (such as the calculation of an average of a number of data points), GA EPD will keep extra decimal places throughout the calculations and then round to the appropriate number of decimal places at the end. This practice prevents the propagation of rounding errors throughout the calculation.

#### VI. Assessment of Waters Using the 5-Part Categorization System

The U.S. EPA has strongly encouraged States to move to a five-part categorization of their waters. GA EPD first adopted the five-part categorization method with the 2008 305(b)/303(d) report. Assessed waters are placed into one or more of five categories as described below:

Category 1 – Data indicate that waters are meeting their designated use(s).

Category 2 – A water has more than one designated use and data indicate that at least one designated use is being met, but there is insufficient evidence to determine whether all uses are being met.

Category 3 – There is insufficient data/information to make a determination as to whether or not the designated use(s) is being met.

Category 4a – Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but a TMDL(s) has been completed for the parameter(s) that is causing a water not to meet its use(s).

Category 4b - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but there are actions in place (other than a TMDL) which are predicted to lead to compliance with water quality standards.

Category 4c - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met, but the impairment is not caused by a pollutant.

Category 5 - Data indicate that at least one designated use is not being met and TMDL(s) need to be completed for one or more pollutants.

A waterbody will be assessed as supporting its designated use (Category 1); not supporting its use (Category 4 or 5); or use assessment pending (Category 2 or 3). It is possible for a water to be in category 4 and 5 at the same time if it is impaired by more than one pollutant. For instance, if a water were impaired for fecal coliform bacteria and dissolved oxygen and a TMDL had been completed only for dissolved oxygen, then the water will be placed in category 4a for dissolved oxygen and category 5 for fecal coliform bacteria.

## VII. Assessment Methodology for Making Use Support Decisions (Listing/Delisting Strategies)

The following provides an outline of the assessment methodology employed during the 2010 Listing Cycle. The conditions under the header “listing” describe what data are needed to place a water on the “not supporting” list for a specific parameter. The conditions under the header “delisting” describe what data are needed to remove a specific parameter from the “not supporting” list. Generally, the data required to “delist” a parameter are the same as would be required to assess a water as “supporting” its use for the parameter in question. The methodology below also describes a number of situations which would result in a water being placed in Category 3 “assessment pending”.

A “preferred minimum data set” is provided for a number of the parameters below. If the quantity of data available is less than the “preferred minimum set” the GA EPD will use best professional judgment to determine if there are sufficient data available to make an assessment of use support or if the water body should be placed in Category 3 until more data are collected. Best Professional Judgment will also be used in cases where data were determined to be suspect.

### A. Fecal Coliform Bacteria: Preferred minimum data set – 4 geometric means (2 collected in winter months and 2 in summer months).

#### 1. Listing –

##### a. One year of available data (Geometric Mean):

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting their use designation if more than 10% of the geometric means exceeded water quality criteria.

##### b. Multiple consecutive years of available data (Geometric Mean):

1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if (a) more than 10% of the geometric means exceeded water quality criteria or (b) if 10% of the geometric means exceeded water quality criteria and one or more winter maximum violations occurred in the

30 day data set(s) where the geometric mean met water quality criteria.

- c. Single Sample Data: In the absence of sufficient data in a data set to calculate a geometric mean, the USEPA's Listing Guidance may have been used to assess bacterial data as described below. GA EPD used its best professional judgment when determining whether to use the single sample data to make a use assessment or to place the water in Category 3 until sufficient data could be collected for use determination. Some factors in making this determination were the size of the data set, the time of year samples were collected, the consistency of the data (i.e. were most of the samples well over the single sample criteria), etc. If it was determined that the single sample data were sufficient for making a use determination:
  - 1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than 10% of the single samples exceeded the USEPA's recommended review criteria for bacteria of 400/100 mL during the months of May-October, and 4,000/100 mL during the months of November-April with the exception of waters classified as "Recreation" where the review criteria are 400/100 mL January-December.
- d. Waters approved for Shellfishing by the Georgia Coastal Resources Division (CRD): CRD designates certain waters of the State as being open for shellfishing. CRD monitors these waters for fecal coliform contamination in accordance with FDA requirements. A geometric mean using the most recent 30 data points was calculated and this mean was compared against CRD's criteria of 14 MPN.
  - 1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting their designated use if the geometric mean of the most recent 30 samples was greater than 14 MPN.
- 2. Delisting –
  - a. One year of available data:
    - 1. Waters were eligible for delisting for fecal coliform if 10% or less of the geometric means exceeded the water quality criteria. If fewer than 4 geometric means were available for assessment, GA EPD may have considered a water eligible for delisting if there were at least two summer geometric means available for assessment and these samples were in compliance with the water quality criteria.
  - b. Multiple consecutive years of available data:
    - 1. Waters were eligible for delisting for fecal coliform bacteria if 10% or fewer of the geometric means exceeded water quality criteria.
  - c. Single Sample Data: Single sample data are typically not be used for delisting purposes as the preferred data set would include the ability to calculate geometric means. However, GA EPD may consider using single sample data for delisting using best professional judgment. Some factors to be taken into consideration would be the size of the data set, the time of year samples the water had been taken and/or whether the original "not supporting" designation was based on single sample data geometric means.
    - 1. Water bodies were eligible for delisting for fecal coliform if 10% or fewer of the single samples exceeded the USEPA's recommended review criteria for bacteria of 400/100 mL during the months of

May-October, and 4,000/100 mL during the months of November-April with the exception of waters classified as “Recreation” where the review criteria are 400/100 mL January-December.

- d. Waters approved for Shellfishing by CRD
  - 1. Waters were eligible for delisting for fecal coliform bacteria if the geometric mean of the last 30 data points was less than or equal to 14 MPN.

B. Dissolved Oxygen (DO), pH, Water Temperature: preferred minimum data set - 12 samples in a 12 month period with 1 or 2 samples collected per month

- 1. Listing\* –
  - a. Dissolved Oxygen - One year of available data or multiple consecutive years of available data:
    - 1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than 10% of the data exceeded water quality criteria
    - 2. In the case where the DO criteria is exceeded more than 10% of the time, but where a “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration has been established, then the dissolved oxygen data was compared against the established “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration. If any of the data points were less than the “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration, then the water was determined not to be supporting its designated use. If none of the DO data was less than the “natural” DO, then the water was determined to be “supporting” its use (as far as DO was concerned).
  - b. Water Temperature, pH - One year or multiple consecutive years of available data:
    - 1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than 10% of the data exceeded water quality criteria

\* Chapter 391-3-6-.03(7) of the Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control recognizes that some waters of the State “naturally” will not meet the instream criteria in the Rules and that this situation does not constitute a violation of water quality standards. Many waters in Georgia, specifically areas in South Georgia and near the Coast, have “natural” dissolved oxygen concentrations below the State’s standard dissolved oxygen criteria (daily average of 5.0 mg/l and an instantaneous minimum of 4.0 mg/l). If a water body is found to have greater than a 10% exceedence rate of the DO criteria and the water body is located in an area of the State where it is anticipated that the low dissolved oxygen condition is natural, then EPD will place the water in Category 3 until work is completed which establishes the “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration for the water body. The measured dissolved oxygen data will then be compared with the “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration and an assessment will be made as to whether the water body is meeting its use.

Georgia also has many blackwater streams. The pH of blackwater streams is naturally low. If a water has been identified as a blackwater stream, then it will not be listed as impaired if greater than 10% of the pH measurements are less than minimum pH criterion of 6.0 as long as there are not point source or land use issues that may be contributing to the low pH status of the stream.

- 2. Delisting –

- a. Dissolved Oxygen - One year or multiple consecutive years of available data:
      - 1. Waters were eligible for delisting for DO if 10% or less of the data exceeded the water quality criteria.
      - 2. In the case where the DO criteria is exceeded more than 10% of the time, but where a “natural” dissolved oxygen concentration has been established, the instream DO data will be compared against the “natural” DO. If no violations of the natural dissolved oxygen concentration occurred, the segment would be eligible for delisting.
    - b. Water Temperature, pH - One year or multiple consecutive years of available data:
      - 1. Waters were eligible for delisting for temperature or pH if 10% or less of the data exceeded the water quality criteria.
- C. Metals: preferred minimum data set – 2 samples in a 12 month period (1 winter, 1 summer)
  - 1. Listing –
    - a. Waterbodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if one sample exceeded the acute criteria in a three-year period or if more than one sample exceeded the chronic criteria in three years.
  - 2. Delisting –
    - a. Waters were eligible for delisting for metals if no exceedences of the acute criteria occurred and no more than one exceedence of the chronic criteria occurred in three years.
- D. Priority Pollutant/Organic Chemicals: preferred minimum data set – 2 samples in a 12 month period (1 winter, 1 summer)
  - 1. Listing –
    - a. Waterbodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than one sample exceeded the criteria in a three-year period.
  - 2. Delisting –
    - a. Waters were eligible for delisting for priority pollutants/organic chemicals if no more than one exceedence of the criteria occurred in a three-year period.
- E. Toxicity:
  - 1. Listing –
    - a. Acute or Chronic toxicity tests conducted on municipal or industrial effluent samples and receiving waters – Waterbodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if:
      - 1. Effluent and/or receiving waters toxicity test(s) consistently predicted in-stream toxicity at critical 7Q10 low stream flow.
  - 2. Delisting –
    - a. New data with a facility consistently passing WET test(s) if listing originated based on effluent toxicity test results will be eligible for delisting.
    - b. New data with receiving waters consistently passing acute and/or chronic toxicity test(s) if listing originated based on stream toxicity test results will be eligible for delisting.



F. Fish/Shellfish Consumption Guidelines:

1. Listing –

a. All Fish/Shellfish Tissue Contaminants Except Mercury:

1. Waterbodies are determined not to be supporting use designation if the State's fish consumption guidelines document recommends that consumption needs to be limited or if no consumption is recommended.

b. Fish/Shellfish Tissue - Mercury:

1. Waterbodies were determined not to be supporting their use designation if the Trophic-Weighted Residue Value (as described in the October 19, 2001 GA EPD "Protocol"), was in excess of Georgia's water quality criterion of 0.3 mg/kg wet weight mercury. Waters where the calculated Trophic-Weighted Residue Value for mercury is equal to 0.3 mg/kg wet weight total were put in Category 3.

2. Delisting –

a. All Fish/Shellfish Tissue Contaminants Except Mercury:

1. Waters were eligible for delisting if data indicated there are no consumption restrictions and fish/shellfish can be consumed in unlimited amounts.

b. Fish/Shellfish Tissue - Mercury:

1. Waters were eligible for delisting if the calculated Trophic-Weighted Residue Values for mercury in fish tissue was less than or equal to 0.3 mg/kg wet weight total. Waters where the calculated Trophic-Weighted Residue Value for mercury was equal to 0.3 mg/kg wet weight total were put in Category 3.

G. Biotic Data (Fish Bioassessments):

1. Listing –Fish Bioassessments were based on Fish Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) data. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if:

- a. The IBI ranking was "Poor" or "Very Poor"; or
- b. The IBI ranking was a low "Fair" and the IWB (Index of Well-Being) ranking was "Poor" or "Very Poor".

2. Delisting –

- a. Waters were eligible for delisting if the water had a Fish IBI rank of "Excellent", "Good", or "Fair" (except in the case of a low IBI "Fair" where the IWB was "Poor" or "Very Poor").

H. Biotic Data (Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments):

1. Listing –Benthic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessments based on a multi-metric index.

- a. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if the narrative rankings were "Poor" or "Very Poor".
- b. If the narrative ranking was "Fair", then the water was placed in Category 3.

2. Delisting –

- a. Water bodies were eligible for delisting if the water scored a narrative ranking of "Very Good" or "Good". If a water scored "Fair", it was placed in Category 3.

- I. Data from Lakes with Site-Specific Criteria:
- Site-specific numeric criteria have been established for 6 major lakes in Georgia including 1) West Point Lake, 2) Lake Walter F. George, 3) Lake Jackson, 4) Lake Allatoona, 5) Lake Sidney Lanier and 6) Carters Lake. These lakes are monitored annually and assessed for these parameters as described below:
1. Listing –
    - a. Chlorophyll a (lake stations): The last five calendar years of chlorophyll a data collected at each site-specific lake criteria station were assessed.
      1. If during the five-year assessment period, the average exceeded the site-specific growing season criteria 2 (or more) out of the 5 years, the lake area representative for that station was assessed as not supporting designated uses. If the average exceeded the site-specific growing season criteria for 1 out of 5 years, the water was placed in Category 3.
    - b. Total Nitrogen (lake stations): The last five calendar years of total nitrogen concentrations collected at each site-specific lake criteria station were assessed.
      1. If greater than 10% of the total nitrogen values exceeded the site-specific criteria, the lake area representative for that station was assessed as not supporting designated uses.
    - c. Fecal Coliform: Typically only single sample data was available for evaluation. The data from the last 5 years were evaluated. If there were sufficient data to calculate a geometric mean, the procedures in Part A.1. of this document was followed.
      1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting their use designation if more than 10% of the single samples exceeded the USEPA's recommended review criteria for bacteria of 400/100 mL.
    - d. Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Water Temperature: The last five calendar years of available data were assessed.
      1. Water bodies were determined not to be supporting use designation if more than 10% of the data exceeded water quality criteria
    - e. Major Lake Tributary Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data collected at each site-specific major lake tributary standard station were assessed.
      1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings exceeded the site-specific criteria, the site was assessed as not supporting designated uses.
    - f. Major Lake Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data were assessed.
      1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings exceeded the site-specific criteria, the site was assessed as not supporting designated uses.
  2. Delisting –
    - a. Chlorophyll a (lake stations): The last five calendar years of chlorophyll a data collected at each site-specific lake standard station were assessed.
      1. If during the five-year assessment period, there were no chlorophyll a growing season averages exceeding the site-specific growing season criteria, the lake area representative for that station was eligible for delisting. If the average exceeded the site-specific

growing season criteria for 1 out of 5 years, the water was placed in Category 3.

- b. Total Nitrogen (lake stations): The last five calendar years of total nitrogen concentrations collected at each site-specific lake standard station were assessed.
  - 1. If 10% or less of the total nitrogen values exceeded the site-specific criteria, the lake area representative for that station was eligible for delisting.
- c. Fecal Coliform: Typically only single sample data were available for evaluation. The data from the last 5 years were assessed. (If there were sufficient data to calculate a geometric mean, the procedures in Part A.2. of this document were followed).
  - 1. If 10% or less of the single samples exceeded the USEPA's recommended review criteria for bacteria of 400/100 mL then the water was eligible for delisting.
- d. Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Water Temperature: The last five calendar years of available data were assessed.
  - 1. If the data have a 10% or less exceedence frequency of the water quality criteria, the water was be eligible for delisting.
- e. Major Lake Tributary Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data collected at each site-specific major lake tributary standard station were assessed.
  - 1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings did not exceed the site-specific criteria then the site was eligible for delisting.
- f. Major Lake Annual Total Phosphorous Loading Criteria: The last five calendar years of available total phosphorous annual loadings data were assessed.
  - 1. If the average of the annual total phosphorous loadings did not exceed the site-specific criteria then the site was eligible for delisting.

J. Enterococci Data Collected under the BEACH Act:

- 1. Listing –
  - a. Monthly Samples: An annual geometric mean was calculated for each year using Enterococci data from the Recreational Season (May – October).
    - 1. If there were five consecutive years of annual geometric means available for assessment, a beach was assessed as not supporting its use designation if more than one annual geometric mean exceeded the criterion (35/100 mL). If there were fewer than five consecutive years of data available for assessment, a beach was assessed as not supporting its use designation if at least one annual geometric mean exceeded the criterion.
  - b. Weekly Samples: Rolling geometric means were calculated using data from all months (not just the Recreational Season).
    - 1. Beaches were determined not to be supporting their designated use if more than 10% of the geometric means exceeded the criterion.
  - c. Mixture of Monthly and Weekly Samples
    - 1. If during the last five years, data were collected monthly some years and weekly other years, then GA EPD assessed each data type separately as described above. If both the monthly and weekly data

types indicate that a beach is not in compliance with the Enterococci criterion as described above, then the beach was assessed as not supporting its use. If the monthly and weekly data types support different listing decisions, then GA EPD used its best professional judgment in making the listing determination. Generally, more weight was placed on the weekly data and on the most recent data set.

2. Delisting –

- a. Monthly Samples: An annual geometric mean was calculated for each year using Enterococci data from the Recreational Season (May – October).
  1. If there were five consecutive years of annual geometric means available for assessment and one or fewer annual geometric means exceeded the criterion, the beach was eligible for delisting. If there were fewer than five consecutive years of data available for assessment, a beach was be eligible for delisting if none of the annual geometric means exceeded the criterion.
- b. Weekly Samples: Rolling geometric means were calculated using data from all months (not just the Recreational Season).
  1. If 10% or less of the geometric means exceeded the criterion, the beach was eligible for delisting.
- c. Mixture of Monthly and Weekly Samples
  1. If during the last five years, data were collected monthly some years and weekly other years, then GA EPD assessed each data type separately as described above. If both the monthly and weekly data types indicate that a beach is in compliance with the Enterococci criterion as described above, then the beach was eligible for delisting.

VIII. Priorities for Action

Section 303(d)(1) of the Clean Water Act requires each state to “establish a priority ranking” for the segments it identifies on the 303(d) list (i.e. those waters in Category 5). This ranking is to take into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such segments. The State is to establish TMDLs in accordance with the priority ranking. States are given considerable flexibility in establishing its ranking system. Georgia has implemented a basin rotation approach when it comes to monitoring waters, establishing TMDLs and permitting. GA EPD has chosen to implement the priority ranking by indicating the year in which the TMDL for each segment on the 303(d) list will be drafted. The establishment date generally follows the basin rotation schedule. There are some cases where GA EPD may choose to draft a TMDL outside of the basin rotation schedule. Factors influencing this decision could include the severity of the pollution and whether development of the TMDL may require additional data collection and complex analysis. TMDLs are typically finalized sometime during the year after they are proposed.

The Georgia General Assembly adopted a State-wide Water Plan into law in 2008. Implementation of this Water Plan may require EPD to shift resources for a time; therefore, the development of TMDLs could temporarily slow down. The dates provided in the “priority” column reflect this possibility. EPD will strive to complete TMDLs before the dates in the “priority” column as resources allow. All dates provided are within the 13-year timeframe that is allowed for TMDL development as provided in the

US EPA 1997 Interpretative Guidance for the TMDL Program. This guidance states that States should develop schedules for establishing TMDLs expeditiously, generally within 8-13 years of being listed.